

Weekly OCII and SFDPH Conference Call Talking Points

12:15 pm-1:00 pm, Telephone

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

February 8, 2021 | Internal Use Only

<u>San Francisco Department of Public Health</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Amy Brownell, Hunters Point Lead- Patrick Fosdahl, Director Environmental Health	<u>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Kasheica McKinney, Hunters Point Project Manager
--	---

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for March 1, but I plan to move to March 8 (after the BCT) at 12:15 pm. (Originally, the Navy had planned its open house meeting for March 8). In December, we suggested meeting once a month in 2021. I looked at the calendar and tried to schedule after the scheduled BCT meetings.

Today's Participants – Yolanda, John, Amy, Kasheica (joined about 20 minutes in),

Communications/Meetings

- **Media:**

- Article in SF Chronicle two weeks ago about development happening in the Shipyard. Nice quotes from Sally Oerth at OCII.

- **Community events/interest:**

- Title VI complaint against SFDPH and BAAQMD on dust issues at Parcel A – The complaint against SFDPH has been dismissed; the complaint against BAAQMD has been accepted for further investigation. I sent Amy the letter EPA issued to SFDPH.
- **Parcel A Fact Sheet** – EPA has the Chinese translation of the Parcel A fact sheet to take up OCII on its offer to do a second review of that translation. I sent the fact sheet directly to Kasheica. Thoughts on timing to get it back? OCII is getting quotes to review the fact sheet.
- **Letter to HPS CAC on EPA's role** – EPA is working on a letter to the Committee to better explain EPA's role at the site and communicate the Navy is the lead agency; therefore, the Navy is the lead spokesperson for the work and should be the lead in addressing questions from the public.
- **SF Shipyard HOA meeting:** The Navy partnered with the SF Shipyard HOA to present at a January 28, 2021 meeting. How did people think the presentation went? Amy attended the meeting.
- **HPS CAC meetings:** Tonight, there appears to be some presentations on the Phase 1 and Phase 2 development. **Upcoming development on Parcel A:** What is the schedule for future development here? Is there a communication strategy for questions/concerns on dust? On Feb 22, there will be a Navy presentation to the E&R subcommittee. EPA will be in attendance, but does not need to be on the agenda. I'll work with Alise to be a "panelist" for the meeting.
- **Navy's March open house meeting** – We aren't very clear on the Navy's plans for this event. Others? Amy might follow-up with the Navy to also ask for more logistics. Amy sent some specific feedback to Navy's contractor.

Internal Use Only

- **Communicating schedule of radiological retesting to the public.** We saw the slide the Navy put together to start communicating this schedule. Thoughts? Next steps? Amy and Yolanda sent comments.
- **Urine Screening:** Any hope on the Navy addressing this?
- ***Never Surrender: The Fight for EJ in BVHP:*** Any feedback from the community?
- **EPA/Navy letters community involvement:** In November, the Navy sent EPA a response to our August 2020 letter on its community involvement and outreach program. The Navy did commit to doing an evaluation of its community outreach and involvement program, starting in March. What are thoughts on how to hold the Navy accountable to this commitment?
- **Congressional interest:** None. We did send congressional offices our letter to the Navy in late December on the radiological RGs for buildings.
- **FOIA:** Our site attorneys continue to work on the *monster* inquiry from Alston Bird law firm in Los Angeles asking for about 47 different topics from 2001-present. Still working on the FOIA from Hanson Bridgett FOIA.
- **SF Supervisor Haney** has requested a hearing on Treasure Island. SFDPH will participate. The Navy may participate.

OCII team – Mayor Breed has appointed Sally Oerth as the Interim Executive Director of OCII. Sally has a wealth of experience at OCII. There will likely be a national recruitment process for this mayoral appointed position.

Health & Safety Scans onsite – The Navy plans mobilize soon for this work. What is the status on the City's request for CDPH to do an independent scan? Will Supervisor Walton reach out to Mark Starr?

Parcel G Building RGs Long-term Protectiveness Evaluation: In late December, EPA issued a response to the Navy's early December response letter to EPA.

- We encouraged the Navy to respond with requested information in a timely manner that would support its desire to start the work scanning the buildings in January 2021. Our letter also suggested a meeting between the FFA-signatories at the Director level, which will likely happen in early March.
- We asked the Navy to share the pertinent information to substantiate the claims of background levels and technical impracticability of implementing the numbers EPA shared in August. The Navy shared some information, which we find deficient to answer these important questions.
- The next step is to coordinate a meeting at the Director level.
- Given the Navy's dates on the new FFA schedule, there is time to resolve this.
- If the discussion went the direction of demolishing every single building, it could be problematic for the schedule.
- We haven't seen an example of the use of RESRAD for potentially radiologically-contaminated buildings to be determined appropriate for residential use. We really need to ensure the tools properly model exposure pathways for a child in a residential yard. Last month, Kasheica mentioned the developers asking how the conversation is moving forward.
- The Navy did include a number of \$300 million to demolish the buildings. A long time ago, there were discussions about the developer demolishing the buildings prior to transfer; however, it is a different environment now.

Internal Use Only

- Recently, we received additional question from Dan Hirsch on our letter to the Navy on RESRAD and BPRG (August 2020). It's important that EPA is being asked to defend the Navy's approach, so it's important to be prepared to respond to these questions.

Parcel G radiological retesting soil fieldwork: EPA continues with our field oversight and split sampling, alongside the state.

- We continue to work with the Navy and the state on the "memorandum to the file" which will document how the Navy will implement the new background value for Cesium and may complete a secondary evaluation on the ROCs. The state seems to be concerned the Navy will not call the new 'clean up trigger' for Cesium a new remediation goal.
- We continue to pay close attention to the Navy's implementation of its **dust management and air monitoring plan**. Since September we continue to ask the Navy to obtain professional meteorological equipment (or stop the practice of subtracting upwind measurements). We have also pointed out where they are subtracting upwind measurements on low wind speed days, which is not the appropriate implementation of the Work Plan. In November, some of the air data numbers for short periods of time exceeded the 24-hour protective limits. We recently received this data and are looking into this.

Parcel D-1 Post-ROD change and LUC RD: We have some concerns with the Navy's plans to issue another draft final ESD. We don't understand how this will address the concerns raised by the regulatory agencies. EPA maintains, as we supported in our comments of September 9 and in our recent legal discussions, that the proposed change fundamentally changes the performance of the remedy and requires a ROD Amendment and associated public participation (the precedent on Parcel G). Those "words" are the ones the Navy has been using.